



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ad-Din's account of Saladin's dealing with the Assassins could be much expanded and corrected.

It would be easy to accumulate further examples of errors and omissions. *Al-muriwa* is not "politeness," as translated on p. 38, and *ḍaraba 'unqahu biyadihi* in its context can only mean "he beheaded him with his own hand;" the story on p. 115 is a bit of self-contradiction of Bahā ad-Din's. But that is enough.

The book is illustrated with five maps and plans and with genealogical tables of the Ayyūbids. There is an index of eleven pages.

DUNCAN B. MACDONALD.

HARTFORD THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY,
Hartford, Conn.

GREEK AND LATIN LOAN-WORDS IN TALMUD, MIDRASH. AND TARGUM.¹

The book before us must be welcomed by everyone interested in the philology of the early post-biblical literature of the Jewish people, as the first attempt at systematizing the linguistic evolution of the Greek and Latin admixtures in the diction of those vast volumes in which is deposited unexplored archæological material enough to occupy students for several generations.

Single monographs treating directly or indirectly of these foreign elements in the writings of the talmudic ages have appeared within the last fifty years in large numbers. To those cited in our author's preface must be added the name of Dr. Joseph Perles, whose *Etymologische Studien* and numerous articles in magazines are among the most valuable contributions to that branch of learning, and it seems strange that one so well-read as our author should have overlooked an authority of no mean importance. But *habent sua fata libelli*.

If Herr Krauss had confined himself to words of indisputable foreign origin in post-biblical Jewish literature, his work would have been much shorter—and this to no disadvantage to the reader—and surely his own task might have been easier. It would have been a safe guide in this vast labyrinth, and a standard authority for further studies along those lines. The author's rules for the transliteration, the result of diligent study of the Greek and Latin literatures, of great familiarity with the Jewish writings under consideration and their literature, and of the results of general phonetic researches of most recent date, are in most cases unexceptionable, and it may well be said that Krauss' book will be, as far as it goes, a standard work for that branch of philology for some time to come. For, to judge from the experience of the past, it can scarcely be expected that another and better work will soon replace it. This being the case, it is the more to be regretted that our author has

¹ GRIECHISCHE UND LATEINISCHE LEHNWÖRTER IN TALMUD, MIDRASCH UND TARGUM. Von Samuel Krauss. Mit Bemerkungen von Immanuel Löw. Preisgekrönte Lösung der Lates'schen Preisfrage. Teil I. Berlin, N. W. 6: S. Calvary & Co., 1898. xli + 347 pp.; 8vo. M. 12.

not emancipated himself from the wrong methods of most of his predecessors in that line, methods long ago discarded in all other linguistic researches.

Every scholar in our days knows how dangerous it is to judge by phonetic resemblances—so tempting to amateurs—in establishing a relationship between the vocabularies of different languages, especially if they belong to different tribes. Dean Swift's raillery at the philology of his days can hardly be appreciated in our generation, because philology has changed its basis entirely from phonetical to etymological, I might say physiological, principles. To bring English *cover* into connection with Hebrew *kever* (קבר), as early editions of Webster's have done, would cover its author with ridicule. A peculiar relic, by the way, of this old method may still be found in Webster's *Dictionary*, where *gonoph* (meant for Hebrew *gannav*) is explained as "a corruption of *gone off*, a slang word for 'thief' or 'amateur pickpocket.'"

Only in luckless Jewish literature it would seem as if the old phonetical method were to be continued and even systematized; as if what heretofore has been looked down upon as a jargon setting under contribution all possible and impossible languages and dialects, and mutilating its unlawful acquisitions beyond recognition, were now to be raised to the dignity of a language that no longer steals, but borrows. We are safe in saying that 25 per cent. of the "loan-words" treated by our author are of good Semitic stock, and all the phonological deductions therefrom fall to the ground.

Leaving out of consideration stems concerning the origin of which scholars disagree, and perhaps will disagree for all time, as, *e. g.*, the root זָנַג, with its numerous derivatives and shades of meanings, in its relation to Greek ζυγ-, ζεγ-. and Latin *jug-um*, and foregoing all readaptations from Greek or Latin of originally Semitic vocables, we take up at random from the author's pages words which are treated as loan-words, but which are indisputably Semitic.²

P. 110: "אבולא *abula*, ξμβολος 'city-gate;' *ambula*, *abbula*, *abula*; *a* for *ε* according to § 119." In other words, אבולא is derived from Greek ξμβολος. Where Krauss found ξμβολος in the meaning of "city-gate" we are unable to tell. From dictionaries we learn that it means anything pointed so as to be easily thrust in, a "peg, stopper, bar," etc. The only meaning that may come into consideration here is the late Greek usage of ξμβολος for "portico, porch." How different is that from a city-gate! And what will our author say when he sees *abullu* "city-gate," talmudic אבולא, as early as 1882 in Schrader's *KAT.*², p. 528, and confirmed in Delitzsch, *Assyrisches Handwörterbuch*, p. 6? Scholars may differ as to the etymology of אבולא (we suggest רב as the root), but of its Semitic home there can be no doubt.

P. 145: "גזמא, Hebrew and Aramean, 'to exaggerate,' from גזמא *gāzma*." Now, *ᾶγασμα* does not mean "exaggeration," but "an object

² For the convenience of the readers, I translate the quotations verbatim, instead of citing them in the original.

of adoration," and furthermore גזם does nowhere mean "to exaggerate." גזם (in Piel) means "to cut, to trim," especially "to cut branches off or make incisions in trees to let the sap drip, to tap" (cf. *Aboda Zara*, 50b). Its secondary meaning (as is frequently the case with verbs which in first line mean "to cut") is "to threaten" (cf. *Numeri Rabbah*, s. 14). In Aramean גזם has the same two meanings, "to cut" (cf. *J'rushalmi Orlah*, III, 63a) and "to threaten" (cf. Targum to Proverbs 16:30, corresponding to Hebr. קרץ). In a transferred sense גזם, like Hebr. קרץ in connection with שפתים, has the meaning of "to cut or trim words, make phrases," and גזומא means "a rhetorical phrase, a hyperbolic expression."

P. 144: "אַרְבֵּל, Aramean 'to sift,' from אַרְבֵּל 'sieve' (cribellum)." Should the Aramean not have a word of its own for such a simple process as sifting? And how did it happen that cribellum traveled from Rome to Palestine and lost its *k* sound on the road? On the other hand, the root ארב (and ערב) has the meaning of weaving, and ארבלא or ערבלא (an enlargement of ארב or ערב) means "network," or "sieve," from which the verb ארבל "to sift," alongside of ערבל "to mix up, to confound," and ערבלאין "a mixed multitude," agreeably to the two meanings of ארב or ערב.

One more specimen of our author's method may be here cited. P. 151: "בִּלָּס, Hebrew, 'to be overcrowded,' from βλίσσω=βλῆζω=βλύω 'to overflow.' Kal partic. sing. בִּלָּס, f. בִּלָּסָה, plur. m. בִּלָּסִים, בִּלָּסִין." The form βλίσσω is found nowhere; βλῆζω means "to gush forth, bubble" (not "to overflow"). By what process could this meaning give rise to a usage like בִּלָּסָה עֵיסָה (*Sabb.*, 76b) "dough of unsifted flour" (containing bran, etc.)? or בִּלָּסִים אוֹצָר (*Bab. Bathra*, 58a) "a storeroom of mixed things, lumber room," or by metaphor (*Gittin*, 67b) "a mind stocked with all kinds of knowledge"? or בִּלָּסִים מִלִּים (*Mikva-oth*, IX, 5) "utensils soaked with a mixture of colors," i. e., showing stains from use, opposed to נִקְיִים "shining, polished"? On the other hand, take בלם as a Semitic root, as an enlargement of בל, in בלל "to mix," and all the applications in the quoted passages are clear and plain, and also the Syriac בלס "trituvit" is easily accounted for.

It is, to be sure, an unpleasant task to criticise a book on which much painstaking labor has been bestowed by a writer of vast information and no mean abilities, but the truth has to be told, were it only in order to warn the uninitiated against too confident reliance on a misleading guide.

Perhaps these remarks may also serve as an appeal to the author to revise, before its publication, the second part of his work, which promises to be a complete dictionary of Greek and Latin loan-words in the talmudic literature.³

MARCUS JASTROW.

GERMANTOWN, PA.

³ Since the above was written, our author's dictionary has appeared, as we see from talogues.